SJ\$ 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

l. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFEN	DEFENDANTS			
DANIEL and SHAWI	NCO F	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC				
(b) County of Residence	County of	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant				
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na Craig Thor Kimmel, E	dress) NO	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.				
Kimmel & Silverman,		Attorneys (i	f Known)			
30 E. Butler Pike			•			
Ambler, PA 19002 (215) 540-8888		•				
II. BASIS OF JURISE	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			AL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Citizen of This State	PTF DEF	Incorporated ar Pri of Business In This		
☐ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another S	State			
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Subject o	[a	of Business In A 3 Foreign Nation	Another State	
		Foreign Country		-		
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE	PENALTY BA	NKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 140 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Mailler Act ☐ 146 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Forcelosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane Product Liability 315 Assault, Libel & Product Liability Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 3350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 335 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 335 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 336 Marine Product Liability 3370 Other Fraud 3370 Other Personal Property Damag	RY 0 610 Agriculture 1 620 Other Food of the conference of Property 2 1 630 Liquor Laws and 0 640 R.R. & True 0 650 Airline Regs 0 660 Other 1 650 Airline Regs 0 710 Fair Labor S 1 600 Act 1 720 Labor/Mgmt 2 730 Labor/Mgmt 2 740 Railway Labor 740 Tailway Labor	## Application ## Application	peal 28 USC 158 thdrawal USC 157 ERTY-RIGHTS pyrights ent idemark L-SECURITY A (1395ff) tok: Lung (923) WCZDIWW (405(g)) ID Title XVI	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
□ 2 Reginal □	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ Reopened	* another district (specify)	Litigation		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which your 15 U.S. C SECTION 1692		urisdictional statutes	unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DEMANDS		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: ☑ Yes ☐ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		роск	ET NUMBER		
Explanation:						
3-28-1		7				
DATE	SIGNÂTURE (FATTORNEY OF R	ECORD			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be us assignment to appropriate calendar.	sed by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: 207 Forest Crepk Drive Lut	km, TX 75901
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudentral Road Hors	man, PA 19044
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	
(Use Reverse Side For Addi	• •
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and a	/
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No□
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	YesD No.
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	
Case Number:Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year p	
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit j	Yes NoE
action in this court?	pending of within one year proviously terminated
	Yes□ No 🗗
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier num	
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No□
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights ca	se filed by the same individual?
	Yes No No
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
· 2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury
3. D Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation
4. 🗆 Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury
5. Patent	5. ☐ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please
	specify)
7. Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability
8. Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. O'All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. \$1692	
(Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFI	CATION
(Check Appropriate Catego	
1. Coursel of record do hereby certify: D Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.1, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and beli	of the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	or, the manages recoverage in this even design case exceed the sain of
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	<i>^</i>
DATE: 3-28-11 (NOW) MURCHMINE	5//00
Attorney-at-Law	Attomey I.D.#
NOTE: A trial-de-novo will be a trial by jury only if there he	as been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within cast is not related to any case now pending or with	hin one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
DATE: 3-28-11 (Next M/Not imme)	らつしろ
Aftorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#

CIV, 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Dansel + Thown +		:	CIVIL ACTION	
v.		:		
NCO Francial Sys	stems, Inc.	: :	NO.	
In accordance with the Civ plaintiff shall complete a C filing the complaint and ser side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	vil Justice Expense ase Management T ve a copy on all defe event that a defen shall, with its first arties, a Case Mana	rack Designation of the contract of the contra	duction Plan of this court, couns on Form in all civil cases at the time 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reagree with the plaintiff regarding brait to the clerk of court and ser Designation Form specifying the	me of everse g said ve on
SELECT ONE OF THE I	FOLLOWING CA	SE MANAGE	MENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases	brought under 28	U.S.C. § 2241	through § 2255.	()
(b) Social Security – Cases and Human Services de	requesting review enying plaintiff Soc	of a decision o ial Security Be	f the Secretary of Health nefits.	()
(c) Arbitration - Cases req	uired to be designa	ted for arbitrati	on under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases invol exposure to asbestos.	ving claims for per	sonal injury or	property damage from	()
(e) Special Management – commonly referred to a the court. (See reverse	s complex and that	need special o	r intense management by	
management cases.)		•	•	()
(f) Standard Management	Cases that do not	fall into any or	ne of the other tracks.	EX
3-28-11 Date	Attorney-at	nnmel -law	Dontel & Shrush Hei Attorney for	<u>sta</u> n
215-540-8168	877-788-	2864	Limmeloc reditlaw.	<u>COm</u>
Telephone	FAX Numi	er	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 DANIEL and SHAWN HEYSHAM, 4 **Plaintiffs** 5 ٧. Case No.: 6 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 **COMPLAINT**

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DANIEL and SHAWN HEYSHAM ("Plaintiffs"), by their attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., allege the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs' Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- 3. Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
 - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

1

 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiffs are natural persons residing in Lufkin, Texas 75901.
- 7. Plaintiffs are persons granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a), and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec 22, 2000).
- Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters
 located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiffs in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

 See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not

engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any

person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

15. Beginning in or around April 2010, and continuing through February 2011,

Defendant constantly and continuously placed collection calls to Plaintiffs seeking and

demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt of another person.

- 16. Upon information and belief, the alleged debt Defendant was seeking to collect arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Defendant, its employees, agents and servants harassed Plaintiffs by making continuous calls to their home telephone number.
 - 18. Defendant identified the debtors as "Patricia" and "Laura or Lori."
- 19. Plaintiffs informed Defendant on numerous occasions that neither "Patricia" nor "Laura/Lori" lived with them, that they did not know "Patricia" or "Laura/Lori", that Defendant had the wrong telephone number, and not to contact Plaintiffs anymore.
- 20. Despite Plaintiffs' requests and instructions not to contact them, Defendant continued to contact Plaintiffs to collect a debt(s) of another person.
- 21. On one occasion, Plaintiffs instructed Defendant to remove their telephone number from its database, and Defendant deceptively claimed to Plaintiffs that, "it was being deleted as we speak."
- 22. The following day, Defendant contacted Plaintiffs once again seeking to collect a debt for another person.
- 23. Defendant made repeated calls to Plaintiffs' telephone almost every day, causing Plaintiffs to receive, at times, two (2) to three (3) collection calls a day.
- 24. Moreover, since Plaintiffs work at night, Defendant's repetitive calls to Plaintiffs during the day were particularly disturbing and harassing, and interrupted their sleep.
- 25. Clearly, Defendant failed to investigate or verify contact information prior to and after calling Plaintiffs.
 - 26. Further, Defendant failed to update its records to avoid further harassment of

Plaintiffs.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 27. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 28. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 29. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it

25

ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 30. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692b(2) of the FDCPA by informing Plaintiffs of another person's debt, specifically that "Patricia" and "Laura/Lori" owed debts;
 - Defendant violated §1692b(3) of the FDCPA by calling Plaintiffs more than once in connection for the collection of a debt for another person;
 - d. Defendant violated §1692c(b) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiffs about a debt allegedly owed by another person;
 - e. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiffs in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
 - f. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiffs' telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiffs;
 - g. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt;
 - h. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable

means with Plaintiffs to collect or attempt to collect a debt; and

 Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, DANIEL and SHAWN HEYSHAM, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiffs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs, DANIEL and SHAWN HEYSHAM, demand a jury trial in this case.

DATED: 3-28-11

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel
Attorney ID # 57100
Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com